

1 JAMES D. BOYLE, ESQ.  
2 Nevada Bar No. 008384  
3 E-mail: jboyle@nevadafirm.com  
4 COTTON, DRIGGS, WALCH,  
5 HOLLEY, WOLOSON & THOMPSON  
6 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor  
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
8 Telephone: 702/791-0308  
9 Facsimile: 702/791-1912

10  
11 EVAN FRAY-WITZER, ESQ.  
12 Massachusetts Bar No. 564349  
13 E-mail: Evan@CFWLegal.com  
14 CIAMPA FRAY-WITZER, LLP  
15 20 Park Plaza, Suite 804  
16 Boston, Massachusetts 02116  
17 Telephone: 617/426-0000

18 VALENTIN DAVID GURVITS, ESQ.  
19 Massachusetts Bar No. 643572  
20 Email: [vgurvits@BostonLawGroup.com](mailto:vgurvits@BostonLawGroup.com)  
21 BOSTON LAW GROUP, PC  
22 825 Beacon Street, Suite 20  
23 Newton, Massachusetts 02459  
24 Telephone: 617/928-1804

25 *Pro Hac Vice Applications Pending*

26 *Attorneys for Defendants Sergej Letyagin and Ideal Consult, LTD.*

17  
18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19  
20 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

21 LIBERTY MEDIA HOLDINGS LLC,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 SERGEJ LETYAGIN, d/b/a  
25 SUNPORNO.COM, IDEAL CONSULT,  
LTD., "ADVERT", "CASTA",  
"TRIKSTER", "WORKER", "LIKIS",  
"TESTER" and DOES 1-50,

26 Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:12-cv-00923-LRH-(GWF)

**DEFENDANTS SERGEJ LETYAGIN AND  
IDEAL CONSULT, LTD.'S  
MOTION AND MEMORANDUM IN  
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS  
FOR LACK OF PERSONAL  
JURISDICTION**

27 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2), Defendants Sergej Letyagin and Ideal Consult,

28

1 LTD., by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby move this Court for entry of an Order  
 2 dismissing Plaintiff Liberty Media Holdings, LLC's complaint. This Motion is based upon the  
 3 pleadings and records on file herein, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities set forth below,  
 4 and the oral argument of counsel presented to this Court, if any.

5 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

6 **I. INTRODUCTION**

7 In what can only be seen as a direct attempt to shop its way into a more sympathetic  
 8 judicial forum, Plaintiff Liberty Media Holdings ("LMH") has resurrected claims identical to  
 9 those which it brought – and then allowed to be dismissed when it became apparent that the court  
 10 there was skeptical of its claims –in the Southern District of Florida. Indeed, in presenting its  
 11 case to this Court on an *ex parte* (and largely under seal) basis, LMH appears to have neglected  
 12 to fully inform this Court of the prior rulings (and prior procedural history) of the Florida court,  
 13 opting instead to present a partial picture at a time when its account could not be challenged by  
 14 the Defendants.

15 For the same reasons that the Florida court doubted that LMH could lawfully assert  
 16 personal jurisdiction over the defendants under either Florida's long arm statute or the federal  
 17 long arm statute, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2), personal jurisdiction is also lacking in this Court over  
 18 Sergej Letyagin ("Mr. Letyagin"), a resident of the Czech Republic, and Ideal Consult, Ltd.  
 19 ("Ideal"), a Seychelles company. Because this Court cannot assert personal jurisdiction over  
 20 these defendants in conformity with the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution,  
 21 the complaint against them must be dismissed.<sup>1</sup>

22 In further support of this Memorandum, the defendants state as follows.

23  
 24  
 25 <sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Motion, Defendants limit their arguments to the lack of personal jurisdiction and grounds  
 26 warranting dismissal pursuant to FRCP 12(b)(2). Nevertheless, Defendants also believe that this Court lacks subject  
 27 matter jurisdiction insofar as Plaintiff is attempting to exert an improper extra-territorial application of copyright  
 28 law, and therefore dismissal is also proper pursuant to FRCP 12(b)(1). Accordingly, Defendants hereby reserve the  
 subject matter jurisdiction issue. In addition, the Defendants also have substantive defenses to the claims raised by  
 LMH – including defenses afforded by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act – but confine the present motion to the  
 gateway personal jurisdictional issue, which is more appropriately suited to a Rule 12 motion to dismiss.

## II. FACTS

## A. THE PARTIES

Ideal is a company headquartered in Seychelles. *See* Affidavit of Sergej Letyagin, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. Ideal owns and operates thousands of different websites, primarily offering adult entertainment. *Id.* Ideal does not maintain (and has never maintained) any servers within Nevada, has no employees in (and has never had any in) Nevada, does not advertise in (and has never advertised in) Nevada, owns no real estate in (and has never owned any real estate in) Nevada, pays no taxes in (and has never paid taxes in) Nevada, and has no bank accounts in (and has never had any bank accounts in) Nevada. *Id.*

Similarly, Ideal does not itself maintain any servers within the United States,<sup>2</sup> has no employees in (and has never had any in) the United States, does not advertise in (and has never advertised in) the United States, owns no real estate in (and has never owned any real estate in) the United States, pays no taxes in (and has never paid taxes in) the United States, and has no bank accounts in (and has never had any bank accounts in) the United States. *Id.*

Mr. Letyagin is an individual residing in the Czech Republic and is the Director of Technology for Ideal. *Id.* He does not now, nor has he ever, individually owned Sunporno.com or any of the other websites referenced in Plaintiff's complaint. *Id.* He has no connections with Nevada at all and, indeed, he has never even visited the United States. *Id.*

And, despite the scurrilous and unfounded allegation in the Complaint that Mr. Letyagin is some sort of criminal mastermind, moving from hidden location to hidden location, Mr.

**Moreover, Mr. Letyagin's address is well known to the Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel, who used this address to correspond with Mr. Letyagin in the course of the Florida**

<sup>2</sup> As is explained in Mr. Letyagin's Affidavit, Ideal contracts with a third-party, Profitrade PLC, doing business as "AdvancedHosters," which provides Ideal with the server space to run the SunPorno website. Profitrade – the company with which Ideal actually has a contractual relationship with respect to servers – is located in the Commonwealth of Dominica. Ideal has been informed by Profitrade that the servers used for the SunPorno.com website are located in Holland and Virginia. Ideal has no control over which servers Profitrade utilizes to host SunPorno.com content and, again, the only relevant agreement is between Ideal, a Seychellois company and Profitrade, a Dominica company.

1       **litigation.** See, e.g., Letyagin Affidavit and **Exhibit 2**, letter from Marc Randazza to Sergey  
 2       Letyagin.<sup>3</sup>

3              In July of 2011, Ideal first obtained the already-existing website, SunPorno.com, along  
 4       with a number of others. At the time of this acquisition, the Sunporno.com domain had already  
 5       been registered by its prior owners through a registrar based in Florida, Moniker Online  
 6       Services.<sup>4</sup> In August of 2011, after reviewing business costs, Ideal decided that it could obtain  
 7       domain registration and privacy services at a lower cost than it was receiving from Moniker.

8       *Letyagin Affidavit.* As a result, in late 2011, Ideal moved all of the domains previously hosted by  
 9       Moniker to UK-based registrar, EvoNames.<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

10          With respect to advertisements that appear on the SunPorno.com website, Ideal has no  
 11       control over which advertisements are displayed. Ideal contracts with three advertising

---

12       <sup>3</sup> It is particularly disturbing that these allegations were made not only in the Complaint, but that similar allegations  
 13       were apparently made to this Court in *ex parte* sealed filings. For example, in his declaration in support LMH's  
 14       motion for alternate service, Plaintiff's counsel states both that he "previously dealt with [defendants'] evasion of  
 15       service in a prior case," and that, if the motion was not heard on an *ex parte* basis, the defendants would "disable all  
 16       existing email addresses in order to further evade service." See Docket No. 4, recently unsealed by this Court.  
 17       Counsel, however, knew these assertions to be patently untrue when made. To the contrary, and despite knowing  
 18       both Mr. Letyagin's home address and the address of Ideal's agent for service of process, the Plaintiff never  
 19       attempted service in the prior action. Instead, on January 15, 2012, Plaintiff's counsel wrote to defendants' counsel:  
 20       "I'm working up an amended complaint, pricing out someone to stalk sergey in Prague, etc. before I blow that kind  
 21       of money, does he want to cash this case out?" See **Exhibit 3**, email of Marc Randazza to Val Gurvits. On January  
 22       30, 2012, the Florida Court issued an order instructing LMH that if it did not effectuate service of process on the  
 23       defendants by March 12, 2012, the case would be dismissed. See **Exhibit 4**. Apparently not wanting to expend the  
 24       money necessary to effectuate proper service consistent with the requirements of due process, the Plaintiff did  
 25       nothing, resulting in the dismissal of the Florida action. See **Exhibit 5**. The Plaintiff then filed the present case,  
 26       with identical allegations, and obtained from this Court leave to utilize alternative service, thereby accomplishing in  
 27       this Court (by withholding crucial information) what it was unable to do in the prior litigation. Such conduct would  
 28       not appear to be in accordance with the dictates of the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 3.3(d)(“In an *ex  
 parte* proceeding, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer that will enable the  
 tribunal to make an informed decision, whether or not the facts are adverse.”)

2       <sup>4</sup> Registrars are entities accredited by ICANN to provide internet registration services. Registration of a domain  
 2       name through a registrar does nothing more than ensure that, when a person types a domain name into a web  
 3       browser, the person is directed to the proper location where the website's files are stored. The assignment of a  
 4       domain name might be considered analogous to the assignment of a telephone number. And, as with a telephone  
 5       number, the change of carriers (for example, from Sprint to Verizon) has no effect on the ownership of the phone  
 6       number in question. See, e.g., *Office Depot, Inc. v. Zuccarini*, 596 F.3d 696, 699 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010), quoted in *Liberty  
 7       Media Holdings v. Letyagin*, Case No. 11-62107, Docket No. 47, attached as **Exhibit 6**.

8       <sup>5</sup> Ironically, LMH cites the fact that Ideal purchased websites previously registered with a Florida registrar as  
 9       evidence that jurisdiction is proper here in Nevada. It does so despite the fact that Florida rejected its argument that  
 10       the same fact supported a finding of personal jurisdiction in Florida. *Liberty Media Holdings v. Letyagin, supra* at p.  
 11       6 (“The Court agrees that merely registering a domain name with a company in Florida is insufficient to support  
 12       personal jurisdiction over the website’s operator.”)

1 networks, ExoClick which is headquartered in Spain; Adxpansion, located in Canada; and Ero-  
 2 Advertising, located in Holland. These three companies provide the actual advertisements  
 3 displayed on the website; all Ideal does is provide banner advertising space on its site and the  
 4 advertising network companies then selects the advertisements that are displayed when a person  
 5 visits the website. This is the way that most advertising on the internet works. *Id.* Like all  
 6 advertising networks, ExoClick, Adxpansion, and Ero-Advertising gear their ads to the location  
 7 of the user. Visitors in France are shown French ads and visitors in Germany are shown German  
 8 ads. Again, this has nothing to do with Ideal. Ideal simply contracts with the (non-United States  
 9 based) advertising companies to provide banner space on its websites. *Id.*

10       Ideal does not itself offer any premium memberships. It has, on occasion, been  
 11 approached by other companies who provide adult video memberships to enter into affiliate  
 12 agreements with them. *Id.* When Ideal has experimented with these affiliate arrangements, the  
 13 affiliate company creates what is known as a “white label site,” which means they put  
 14 SunPorno’s logo on a site which they create, own, and run. *Id.* Currently, there is no premium  
 15 option on the SunPorno.com website since there seemed to be little interest in it. *Id.* When the  
 16 option did exist, a visitor who clicked on the “premium membership” button was sent to a third-  
 17 party website which Ideal did not control and could not control. Again, this type of relationship  
 18 is very common in the adult entertainment website industry and one must assume that Liberty  
 19 Media is well aware that Ideal was not in control of the premium site or its terms and conditions.  
 20 *Id.*

21       None of Ideal’s websites, including SunPorno.com accept credit cards, nor has Ideal set  
 22 up any credit card accounts with Visa, Mastercard or American Express to accept such payments.  
 23 This is so because Ideal does not enter into financial transactions with visitors to its websites.  
 24 This is true for visitors who may come from the United States or any other part of the world. *Id.*

25           **B. THE FLORIDA LITIGATION**

26       On September 26, 2011, LMH filed an action in the Southern District of Florida alleging  
 27 the same violations of copyright as are alleged in this litigation. On November 17, 2011, having  
 28 identified the proper parties to the litigation, LMH filed an amended complaint in which it named

1 as defendants all of the same defendants named in the present litigation. *See Exhibit 7,*  
 2 Amended Complaint in Florida action. On December 9, 2011, LMH's counsel sent a request for  
 3 waiver of formal service to Mr. Letyagin at his home address in the Czech Republic via UPS. At  
 4 the same time, LMH's counsel sent a request for waiver of formal service to Ideal in Seychelles.  
 5 Both of these correspondence were received by the intended recipients.

6 In the Florida litigation, the Plaintiff alleged that personal jurisdiction was proper under  
 7 either the Florida long arm statute or under the Federal long arm statute, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2).  
 8 *Id.* LMH subsequently sought injunctive relief against Mr. Letyagin and Ideal. On December  
 9 14, 2011, the Florida Court denied LMH's motion, specifically holding that LMH could not  
 10 show a likelihood of success because the Court could not exercise personal jurisdiction over  
 11 either defendant consistent with the requirements of due process. Specifically, after first  
 12 rejecting LMH's argument that personal jurisdiction was proper under Florida's long arm statute  
 13 (*see Exhibit 6*, p. 6), the Court also rejected personal jurisdiction based on the federal long arm  
 14 statute. *Id.* at pp. 7-10 ("Plaintiff has not shown that Defendant's conduct can, in line with the  
 15 Constitution, subject it to jurisdiction in this forum. Plaintiff contends that Defendant has  
 16 'considerable' web traffic originating from the United states and has presented an exhibit  
 17 showing that fifteen percent of the visitors to the website are from the United States.")

18 Following the Court's order, LMH's counsel proposed settlement discussions before  
 19 LMH undertook the expense of formally serving the defendants. On January 30, 2012, the  
 20 Florida Court issued an order instructing LMH that if it did not effectuate service of process on  
 21 the defendants by March 12, 2012, the case would be dismissed. See **Exhibit 4**. The Plaintiff  
 22 did not serve the defendants (and do not appear to have attempted to serve the defendants),  
 23 resulting in the dismissal of the Florida action. See **Exhibit 5**.

### 24                   **III. ARGUMENT**

#### 25                   **A. STANDARD**

26 "Where a defendant challenges the exercise of personal jurisdiction, the plaintiff bears  
 27 the burden of demonstrating that the court has jurisdiction over the defendant." *Speed*  
 28 *Technologies, LLC v. Bully Dog Sales & Distribution, LLC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86959 (D.

1 Nev. 2011), *citing Schwartzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 800 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
 2 2004). “The plaintiff has the burden of establishing personal jurisdiction by demonstrating  
 3 jurisdiction is: (1) permitted under the applicable state's long-arm statute, and (2) that the  
 4 exercise of jurisdiction does not violate federal due process.” *Corbo v. Laessig*, 2012 U.S. Dist.  
 5 LEXIS 43332, 9-10 (D. Nev. 2012), quoting *Ziegler v. Indian River County*, 64 F.3d 470, 473  
 6 (9th Cir. 1995). Because Nevada's long-arm statute reaches to the full limits of due process, the  
 7 Court need only decide whether the exercise of personal jurisdiction will comport with the  
 8 constitutional requirements of due process. *Hoag v. Sweetwater Int'l.*, 857 F.Supp. 1420, 1424  
 9 (D. Nev. 1994). In making its determination, the Court must analyze whether personal  
 10 jurisdiction exists over each defendant separately. *Harris Rutsky & Co. Ins. Servs. v. Bell &*

11 *Clements Ltd.*, 328 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2003)

12 A similar analysis occurs with respect to federal long arm jurisdiction under Fed. R. Civ.  
 13 P. 4(k)(2). Under Rule 4(k)(2), “a court may exercise jurisdiction when three requirements are  
 14 met. First, the claim against the defendant must arise under federal law.... Second, the defendant  
 15 must not be subject to the personal jurisdiction of any state court of general jurisdiction.... Third,  
 16 the federal court's exercise of personal jurisdiction must comport with due process.” *Holland*  
 17 *Am. Line, Inc. v. Wartsila N. Am., Inc.*, 485 F.3d 450, 461 (9th Cir. 2007). “The due process  
 18 analysis under Rule 4(k)(2) is nearly identical to traditional personal jurisdiction analysis with  
 19 one significant difference: rather than considering contacts between the [defendants] and the  
 20 forum state, we consider contacts with the nation as a whole.” *Id* at 462.

21 **B. THE COURT CANNOT EXERCISE PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER MR.  
 22 LETYAGIN OR IDEAL UNDER NEVADA'S LONG ARM STATUTE.**

23 “For a non-resident defendant, the assertion of jurisdiction is constitutionally proper  
 24 under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment only where there are continuous  
 25 and systematic contacts with the forum state (general jurisdiction)... or when there are sufficient  
 26 minimal contacts with the forum state such that the assertion of personal jurisdiction does not  
 27 offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice (specific jurisdiction).” *Righthaven,*  
 28

1       *LLC v. Va. Citizens Def. League, Inc.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67659, 3-4 (D. Nev. 2011)  
 2 (internal citations omitted).

3              In the present case, LMH has not alleged – and cannot allege – facts sufficient to subject  
 4 either Mr. Letyagin or Ideal to either general or specific personal jurisdiction in Nevada.

5              **1. General Jurisdiction**

6              “To establish general personal jurisdiction, the plaintiff must demonstrate the defendant  
 7 has sufficient contacts to ‘constitute the kind of continuous and systematic general business  
 8 contacts that ‘approximate physical presence.’” *Glencore Grain Rotterdam B.V. v. Shivnath Rai*  
 9 *Harnarain Co.*, 284 F.3d 1114, 1124 (9th Cir. 2002)(quoting *Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v.*  
 10 *Augusta Nat'l Inc.*, 223 F.3d 1082, 1086 (9th Cir. 2000), modified, *Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre*  
 11 *Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme*, 433 F.3d 1199, 1207 (9th Cir. 2006)). “[A] defendant whose  
 12 contacts are substantial, continuous, and systematic is subject to a court's general jurisdiction  
 13 even if the suit concerns matters not arising out of his contacts with the forum.” *Glencore Grain*,  
 14 284 F.3d at 1123 (citing *Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall*, 466 U.S. 408, 415  
 15 n. 9, 104 S.Ct. 1868, 80 L. Ed. 2d 404).

16              Although the Complaint makes the conclusory statement that “the Defendants,” as a  
 17 group have had “systemic and continuous contacts with the district,” (see Complaint, ¶46), there  
 18 is not a single factual allegation made – nor could there be – to support this statement.<sup>6</sup> To the  
 19 contrary, neither Mr. Letyagin nor Ideal have *any* contacts with Nevada, much less “systemic  
 20 and continuous contacts” which would “approximate physical presence.”

21              Ideal does not maintain (and has never maintained) any servers within Nevada, has no  
 22 employees in (and has never had any in) Nevada, does not advertise in (and has never advertised  
 23 in) Nevada, owns no real estate in (and has never owned any real estate in) Nevada, pays no  
 24 taxes in (and has never paid taxes in) Nevada, and has no bank accounts in (and has never had  
 25 any bank accounts in) Nevada. Neither Ideal nor SunPorno.com are registered to do business in  
 26 Nevada (nor have they ever been so registered). *Letyagin Affidavit*, ¶10. Similarly, Mr. Letyagin

---

27              <sup>6</sup> It is interesting that LMH feels comfortable making such an allegation given that it also admits that it does not  
 28 know the identity of six defendants who are identified only by nickname and fifty other “Doe” defendants.

1 has no personal ties to Nevada. He does not maintain any servers in Nevada, does not advertise  
 2 in Nevada, does not own real estate in Nevada, and has no bank accounts in Nevada (nor has he  
 3 ever done any of the forgoing). *Letyagin Affidavit*, ¶13. Indeed, Mr. Letyagin has never even  
 4 visited the State of Nevada. *Letyagin Affidavit*, ¶2.

5 A complete absence of contacts with Nevada cannot possibly be “systemic and  
 6 continuous contacts,” and, as such, LMH cannot demonstrate that the Court has general personal  
 7 jurisdiction over either defendant.

## 8           **2. Specific Jurisdiction**

9         “Specific personal jurisdiction is established if plaintiff can show: (1) the defendant has  
 10 performed some act or transaction within the forum or purposefully availed himself of the  
 11 privileges of conducting activities within the forum, (2) the plaintiff’s claim arises out of or  
 12 results from the defendant’s forum-related activities, and (3) the exercise of jurisdiction over the  
 13 defendant is reasonable.” *Corbo v. Laessig*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43332, 9-10 (D. Nev. 2012),  
 14 citing *Pebble Beach Co. v. Caddy*, 453 F.3d 1151, 1155-56 (9th Cir. 2006). “If any of the three  
 15 requirements is not satisfied, jurisdiction in the forum would deprive the defendant of due  
 16 process of law.” *Corbo, supra, citing Omeluk v. Langsten Slip & Batbyggeri A/S*, 52 F.3d 267,  
 17 270 (9th Cir.1995).

18         “Under the first prong of the specific jurisdiction test the plaintiff must establish either  
 19 that the defendant: (1) purposefully availed himself of the privilege of conducting his activities in  
 20 the forum, or (2) purposefully directed his activities toward the forum. ...Evidence of availment  
 21 is typically action taking place in the forum that invokes the benefits and protections of the laws  
 22 in the forum. Evidence of direction usually consists of directing conduct from outside the forum  
 23 into the forum.” *Corbo* at 9-10 (*internal citations omitted*).

24         Presumably, given the wholesale lack of facts alleged in the complaint which would  
 25 support a finding of specific jurisdiction over the defendants, LMH intends to argue that the mere  
 26 fact that the SunPorno.com website is accessible in Nevada (as it is in the rest of the free world),  
 27  
 28

1 where the Plaintiff claims to have a primary place of business,<sup>7</sup> is a sufficient basis for  
 2 jurisdiction against Ideal and/or Mr. Letyagin. It is not.

3 Because a “claim for copyright infringement sounds in tort, the plaintiff must prove that  
 4 the defendants purposefully directed their actions at Nevada. *Zuffa, LLC v. Showtime Networks,*  
 5 *Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60711, \*22 (D. Nev. 2007). The court utilizes an “effects test to  
 6 determine if the defendant (1) committed an intentional act, (2) expressly aimed at the forum, (3)  
 7 causing harm that the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum state.” *Id.*, quoting  
 8 *Dole Food Co. v. Watts*, 303 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).

9 Assuming, *arguendo*, that the maintenance of a website is a sufficient act in and of itself  
 10 to constitute an “intentional act,” LMH nevertheless cannot meet the second or third prongs of  
 11 the purposeful direction test.

12 First, the mere maintenance of a website available anywhere in the world (even an  
 13 interactive one), does not meet the test of being “expressly aimed at the forum” for the very  
 14 reason that it is equally available everywhere in the world. *Medinah Mining, Inc. v. Amunategui*,  
 15 237 F. Supp. 2d 1132, 1136 (D. Nev. 2002)(“Because anyone could access the discussion group,  
 16 the court could not see how it could be inferred that the postings alone could be directed at  
 17 residents of the forum. ...there is no evidence that [the defendant] did any business with anyone  
 18 in Nevada or that he directed his allegedly defamatory comments at Nevada. He posted  
 19 messages on a website that could be accessed by anyone around the world who had access to the  
 20 Internet. There is no evidence that any Nevada resident actually did access the alleged  
 21 defamation”); *Zuffa, LLC v. Showtime Networks, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60711 (D. Nev.  
 22 2007) (knowledge that copyright holder was located within the jurisdiction “by itself fails to

---

23     <sup>7</sup> Interestingly, although the Plaintiff alleges in this action that it is a California corporation with a principle place of  
 24 business in Nevada, when it has initiated actions against non-resident defendants in California, it has omitted this  
 25 claim, stating instead that “Liberty is a California LLC with a mailing address of 302 Washington Street, Suite 321,  
 26 San Diego, CA 92103.” See, e.g., *Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. Travis Noble*, 11-CV-00571-JAH-BLM,  
 27 Document No. 1 (S.D. Cal. 2011); *Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. John Doe*, 11-CV-0774-IEG-WVG (S.D. Cal.  
 28 2011); *Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. John Jacob Lee*, 11-CV-0578-JLS-BGS (S.D. Cal. 2011); *Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. Henson*, 11-CV-0652-MMA-BLM (S.D. Cal. 2011). In each of these actions alleging copyright  
 infringement, LMH alleged that jurisdiction was proper in California because, *inter alia* – by allegedly infringing on  
 the Plaintiff’s copyrights, the defendants had “aimed his tortious acts toward this district with the knowledge that the  
 negative consequences would be felt in this jurisdiction.”

1 establish that Showtime and ProElite individually targeted Plaintiff"); *Cybersell, Inc. v.*  
 2 *Cybersell, Inc.*, 130 F.3d 414, 418-420 (9th Cir. 1997) ("... so far as we are aware, no court has  
 3 ever held that an Internet advertisement alone is sufficient to subject the advertiser to jurisdiction  
 4 in the plaintiff's home state. ... Rather, in each, there has been 'something more' to indicate that  
 5 the defendant purposefully (albeit electronically) directed his activity in a substantial way to the  
 6 forum state. ... Cybersell FL did nothing to encourage people in Arizona to access its site, and  
 7 there is no evidence that any part of its business (let alone a continuous part of its business) was  
 8 sought or achieved in Arizona. ... There is no evidence that any Arizona resident signed up for  
 9 Cybersell FL's web construction services. It entered into no contracts in Arizona, made no sales  
 10 in Arizona, received no telephone calls from Arizona, earned no income from Arizona, and sent  
 11 no messages over the Internet to Arizona. ... In short, Cybersell FL has done no act and has  
 12 consummated no transaction, nor has it performed any act by which it purposefully availed itself  
 13 of the privilege of conducting activities, in Arizona, thereby invoking the benefits and  
 14 protections of Arizona law. We therefore hold that Cybersell FL's contacts are insufficient to  
 15 establish 'purposeful availment')."

16 Numerous other courts, in applying the effects test, have similarly held that, for specific  
 17 jurisdiction to be founded on actions expressly aimed at the forum state, the Plaintiff must prove  
 18 that such acts "are performed for the very purpose of having their consequences felt in the forum  
 19 state." *Dakota Indus., Inc. v. Dakota Sportswear, Inc.*, 946 F.2d 1384, 1390-91 (8th Cir. 1991)  
 20 (*quoting Brainerd v. Governors of Univ. of Alberta*, 873 F.2d 1257, 1260 (9th Cir. 1989)). See  
 21 also *Fraserside IP L.L.C. v. Hammy Media, LTD*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5359, 24-25 (N.D.  
 22 Iowa Jan. 17, 2012) ("Although I accept as true Fraserside's allegations that xHamster  
 23 intentionally infringed Fraserside's registered copyrights and trademarks, these allegations,  
 24 alone, fail to demonstrate that xHamster 'uniquely or expressly aimed' its tortious acts at Iowa.  
 25 ... Although xHamster's website is both commercial and interactive, as an Iowa district court  
 26 noted in a case presenting similar facts, such a website 'is arguably no more directed at Iowa  
 27 than at Uzbekistan.'"); *be2 LLC v. Ivanov*, 642 F.3d 555, 558 (7th Cir. 2011) ("If the defendant  
 28 merely operates a website, even a 'highly interactive' website, that is accessible from, but does

1 not target, the forum state, then the defendant may not be haled into court in that state without  
 2 offending the Constitution"); *Toys "R" Us, Inc. V. Step Two, S.A.*, 318 F.3d 446, 452-54 (3d Cir.  
 3 2003) ("[T]he mere operation of a commercially interactive web site should not subject the  
 4 operator to jurisdiction ... Rather, there must be evidence that the defendant 'purposefully  
 5 availed' itself of conducting activity in the [jurisdiction]."); *Instabook Corp. v.*  
 6 *Instapublisher.com*, 469 F. Supp. 2d 1120, 1127 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (finding insufficient contacts in  
 7 a patent infringement case since, among other reasons, "Defendant could not reasonably  
 8 anticipate being haled into court in Florida based on its operation of interactive websites  
 9 accessible in Florida and its sales to two Florida residents" in the absence of "targeting or  
 10 solicitation of Florida residents"); *ESAB Group, Inc. v. Centricut, L.L.C.*, 34 F. Supp. 2d 323,  
 11 331 (D.S.C. 1999) ("While it is true that anyone, anywhere could access Centricut's home page,  
 12 including someone in South Carolina, it cannot be inferred from this fact alone that Centricut  
 13 deliberately directed its efforts toward South Carolina residents"); *Johnson v. Arden*, 614 F.3d  
 14 785, 797-798 (8th Cir. 2010) ("...the Johnsons have failed to prove that  
 15 www.BoutiqueKittens.com is uniquely or expressly aimed at Missouri; thus *Calder* provides no  
 16 support for their Lanham Act claim.")

17 In the present case, LMH has not alleged – nor can it allege – that the defendants  
 18 "uniquely or expressly" aimed the SunPorno.com website at Nevada any more than they were  
 19 able to allege in the Florida litigation that the website was "uniquely or expressly" aimed at  
 20 Florida. Indeed, the very fact that LMH has attempted to bring the same claims in two different  
 21 jurisdictions proves the defendants' point. Accordingly, as LMH cannot meet the second prong  
 22 of the effects test and personal jurisdiction is, therefore, inappropriate in Nevada and the case  
 23 must be dismissed.

24 Although the court need go no further, it is worth noting that LMH also cannot meet the  
 25 third prong: that the defendants aimed their conduct at Nevada *knowing* that it would cause harm  
 26 to the Plaintiff there. Although the Plaintiff alleges that it is a California company with a  
 27 primary place of business in Nevada, it does not allege (and cannot allege) that either of the  
 28 defendants took some action knowing that harm would be felt in Nevada. Putting aside the fact

1 that the complaint identifies no actions actually taken by either defendant which was aimed at  
2 Nevada, it also fails to properly allege that either Mr. Letyagin or Ideal knew that the Plaintiff  
3 would suffer harm in Nevada. To the contrary, Exhibit 26 to the Plaintiff's Complaint – which  
4 contains the certificates of registration of the allegedly infringed-upon works – identifies the  
5 "Copyright Claimant" in each instance as "Liberty Media Holdings, LLC, dba Excelsior  
6 Productions, 302 Washington Street, STE 161, San Diego, CA 92103." The certificates do not  
7 suggest in any way that the copyright owner is located in Nevada. In other words, even if Mr.  
8 Letyagin or Ideal were aware that users were posting LMH's copyrighted works at the  
9 SunPorno.com website, there was no reason that they would have known that LMH would suffer  
10 any injury in Nevada, as opposed to California, where the public records indicated the Copyright  
11 Claimant was located. This, too, is fatal to LMH's claim of specific jurisdiction in Nevada.  
12 *Zuffa, LLC, supra*, at \*26 ("...there are no facts alleged here that Showtime and ProElite were  
13 aware that the allegedly infringing footage belonged to Plaintiff or that Defendants knew or  
14 should have known that the allegedly infringing footage would harm Plaintiff in Nevada.  
15 Because Plaintiff fails to show that ProElite and Showtime expressly aimed the alleged  
16 infringing telecast at Nevada, Plaintiff has not met its burden of showing purposeful direction  
17 under the effects test"); *Medinah Mining, Inc., supra* at 1137 (even a finding that the defendants  
18 engaged in a "foreign act with foreseeable effects in the forum state" was insufficient to find  
19 specific jurisdiction with the "something more" such as "targeting a known forum resident");  
20 *Cybersell, Inc., supra* at 420 ("Nor does the "effects" test apply with the same force to Cybersell  
21 AZ as it would to an individual, because a corporation does not suffer harm in a particular  
22 geographic location in the same sense that an individual does. ...Cybersell FL's web page simply  
23 was not aimed intentionally at Arizona knowing that harm was likely to be caused there to  
24 Cybersell AZ")(internal citations omitted); *Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v. Augusta Nat'l Inc.*, 223  
25 F.3d 1082, 1087-88 (9th Cir. 2000)(collecting 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit cases and discussing the requirement  
26 that the defendant have specific knowledge of the harm to be done in the forum to justify a  
27 finding of "express aiming.") Because the Plaintiff has not, and cannot, allege facts sufficient to  
28 meet the third prong of the effects test, personal jurisdiction against Mr. Letyagin and Ideal does

1 not lie and the complaint against them must be dismissed.

2           **C. THE PLAINTIFF CANNOT ESTABLISH JURISDICTION OVER MR. LETYAGIN OR  
3 IDEAL PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 4(k)(2).**

4           Preliminarily, it bears repeating that this is the second Federal Court which has been  
5 asked to consider the question of whether LMH could assert federal long arm jurisdiction over  
6 Mr. Letyagin or Ideal. And, because the question to be answered is whether LMH has alleged  
7 sufficient minimum contacts as between the defendants and the United States as a whole, the  
8 analysis is no different in Nevada than it was in Florida. In the Florida action, the Court  
9 specifically concluded that jurisdiction could *not* be premised against Mr. Letyagin or Ideal  
10 under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2):

12           Specifically, Plaintiff has not shown that Defendant's conduct can, in line with the  
13 Constitution, subject it to jurisdiction in this forum. Plaintiff contends that Defendant has  
14 "considerable" web traffic originating from the United States and has presented an  
15 exhibit showing that fifteen percent of the visitors to its website are from the United  
16 States. ...Precedent, however, establishes that maintaining a website accessible to users in  
17 a jurisdiction does not subject a defendant to be sued there; those users must be directly  
18 targeted, such that the defendant can foresee having to defend a lawsuit.

19           ... Here, Plaintiff has alleged that Defendant's website receives traffic and business from  
20 United States customers but has not met its burden of showing that Defendant did  
21 anything to target customers from the United States or even that anyone from the United  
22 States made a purchase on Defendant's website.

23           *Liberty Media Holdings v. Letyagin*, Case No. 11-62107, Docket No. 47, attached as Exhibit 6,  
24 pp. 7-10.

25           The Court should reach the same conclusion here.<sup>8</sup> In the Ninth Circuit, a party asserting  
26 personal jurisdiction under Rule 4(k)(2) must prove three elements: (1) that the claims arise  
27 under federal law; (2) that the defendant is not subject to personal jurisdiction in any state court

---

28           <sup>8</sup> Although the technical requirements may not be met for formal issue preclusion, it would be perverse to allow  
29 LMH to jump from Federal Court to Federal Court asserting the same federal jurisdictional argument in hopes of  
30 finally finding a sympathetic court. A certain level of deference to the findings of the Federal District Court in the  
31 Southern District of Florida is, therefore, appropriate in this case. As the First Circuit has stated, albeit in a different  
32 context, a litigant should not be afforded "not only his allotted bite at the apple, but an invitation to gnaw at will."  
*Marie v. Allied Home Mortg. Corp.*, 402 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2005).

1 in the United States; and (3) the exercise of personal jurisdiction comports with the constitutional  
 2 requirements of due process. *Holland America Line, Inc. v. Wartsila Corporation*, 485 F.3d 450,  
 3 461 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).<sup>9</sup> In the present case, it is only the third element which is in dispute.  
 4

5 Given Mr. Letyagin's and Ideal's wholesale lack of contacts with the United States, LMH  
 6 cannot hope to show that jurisdiction can be asserted over them consistent with the Due Process  
 7 Clause of the United States Constitution. "The due process analysis under Rule 4(k)(2) is nearly  
 8 identical to traditional personal jurisdiction analysis with one significant difference: rather than  
 9 considering contacts between the [defendants] and the forum state, we consider contacts with the  
 10 nation as a whole." *Id* at 462.

11 Indeed, in *Holland America Line, Inc.*, the Court rejected a finding of personal  
 12 jurisdiction over the defendants despite the fact that the defendants maintained a website  
 13 accessible in the United States, had advertised in marine publications distributed in the United  
 14 States, sent marketing representatives into the United States, and had its representatives visit  
 15 trade shows in the United States. Nevertheless, the Court concluded that these "scant, fleeting,  
 16 and attenuated" contacts with the United States were insufficient bases to assert personal  
 17 jurisdiction over the defendants in the United States. Indeed, the Court there noted that "in the  
 18 fourteen years since Rule 4(k)(2) was enacted, none of our cases has countenanced jurisdiction  
 19 under the Rule." *See also Cepia, L.L.C. v. Alibaba Group Holding Ltd.*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 20 129126, 19-20 (E.D. Mo. 2011) ("Due process analysis concerning jurisdiction under Rule  
 21 4(k)(2) must be focused on whether the 'defendant purposely directed its activities at residents of  
 22 the forum, and whether litigation results from alleged injuries that arise out of, or relate to those  
 23 activities.' Again, Plaintiff has not shown Alibaba Holding has purposely directed its activities  
 24 at Missouri. ...Therefore, jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(k)(2) is not proper

---

25  
 26  
 27 <sup>9</sup> This is the same test that was applied by the Southern District of Florida when it reached its conclusion that neither  
 28 Mr. Letyagin nor Ideal were subject to personal jurisdiction in the United States pursuant to Rule 4(k)(2).

1 in this case") *1<sup>st</sup> Technology, LLC v. Digital Gaming Solutions, S.A.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 2 27786 (E.D. Mo. 2009)(“the exercise of jurisdiction is consistent with the Constitution depends  
 3 on whether the defendant has sufficient contacts with the United States as a whole to justify the  
 4 exercise of personal jurisdiction under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. ...Once  
 5 again, the question of due process concerns whether the foreign defendant purposefully directed  
 6 his activities at residents of the forum, and whether the litigation results from alleged injuries that  
 7 arise out of, or relate to those activities”); *Renaissance Pen Company v. Krone, LLC*, 2006 U.S.  
 8 Dist. LEXIS 21794 (E.D. Mo. 2006)(“Here, the existence of jurisdiction is not consistent with  
 9 the Constitution. Defendant does not have the minimum contacts with any state, nor the United  
 10 States as a whole, required to satisfy personal jurisdiction.”)

12           Similarly, in *Pebble Beach Company v. Caddy*, 453 F.3d 1151 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006), the Ninth  
 13 Circuit rejected a series of arguments similar to those advanced by LMH here:

14           ...First, Pebble Beach claims that because Caddy selected a ‘.com’ domain name it shows  
 15 that the United States was his ‘primary’ market and that he is directly advertising his  
 16 services to the United States. Second, Pebble Beach asserts that his selection of the name  
 17 ‘Pebble Beach’ shows the United States is his primary target because ‘Pebble Beach’ is a  
 18 famous United States trademark. Third, Pebble Beach asserts that Caddy’s intent to  
 19 advertise to the United States is bolstered by the fact that Caddy’s facilities are located in  
 a resort town that caters to foreigners, particularly Americans. Finally, Pebble Beach  
 asserts that a majority of Caddy’s business in the past has been with Americans.

20           As before, Pebble Beach’s arguments focus too much on the effects prong and not enough  
 21 on the ‘something more’ requirement. First, following the rationale articulated in  
 22 Cybersell, Rio Properties, and Panavision, we conclude that the selection of a particular  
 23 domain name is insufficient by itself to confer jurisdiction over a non-resident defendant,  
 even under Rule 4(k)(2), where the forum is the United States. The fact that the name  
 24 ‘Pebble Beach’ is a famous mark known world-wide is of little practical consequence  
 when deciding whether action is directed at a particular forum via the world wide web.  
 Also of minimal importance is Caddy’s selection of a ‘.com’ domain name instead of a  
 25 more specific United Kingdom or European Union domain. To suggest that ‘.com’ is an  
 indicator of express aiming at the United States is even weaker than the counter assertion  
 26 that having ‘U.K.’ in the domain name, which is the case here, is indicative that Caddy  
 was only targeting his services to the United Kingdom. Neither provides much more than  
 27 a slight indication of where a website may be located and does not establish to whom the  
 website is directed. Accordingly, we reject these arguments.

28

1       This leaves Pebble Beach's arguments that because Caddy's business is located in an area  
 2       frequented by Americans, and because he occasionally services Americans, jurisdiction is  
 3       proper. These arguments fail for the same reasons; they go to effects rather than express  
 4       aiming. Pebble Beach's arguments do have intuitive appeal--they suggest a real effect on  
 5       Americans. However, as reiterated throughout this opinion, showing 'effect' satisfies  
 6       only the third prong of the Calder test--it is not the 'something more' that is required.

5       *Id. at , 1159-60.*

6       In the present case, neither Mr. Letyagin nor Ideal have any significant connections with  
 7       the United States. Ideal does not advertise (and has not advertised) anywhere in the United  
 8       States, owns no real estate (and has never owned any real estate) anywhere in the United States,  
 9       pays no taxes (and has never paid taxes) anywhere in the United States, and has no bank  
 10      accounts (and has never had any bank accounts) anywhere in the United States. Neither Ideal  
 11      nor SunPorno.com are registered to do business anywhere in the United States (nor have they  
 12      ever been so registered). Ideal does not maintain any servers within the United States, enters  
 13      into no financial transactions with users in the United States (or anywhere for that matter), does  
 14      not host its domains with United States hosting companies, and does not register its domains  
 15      with United States based registrars. *See* Letyagin Affidavit.

16       Mr. Letyagin himself owns no property in the United States, does not pay taxes in the  
 17       United States, has no bank accounts or other property in the United States, and, indeed, he has  
 18       never even visited the United States. *Id.* Such facts bely any argument that either Mr. Letyagin  
 19       or Ideal have sufficient minimum contacts to subject them to jurisdiction under Rule 4(k)(2)  
 20       consistent with the due process requirements of the United States Constitution.<sup>10</sup>

21       Because the Complaint does not – and cannot – allege sufficient facts to support a finding  
 22       of minimum contacts as between either Mr. Letyagin or Ideal and the United States as would be  
 23       required by the Due Process Clause of the Constitution, the Court cannot properly assert personal  
 24       

---

25  
 26  
 27       <sup>10</sup> LMH's absurd attempts (*see* Complaint, p. 55) to base jurisdiction on third-party banner advertisements which  
 28       utilize the likeness of international porn star Ron Jeremy and which refer to the benefits of penis enlargement  
 29       products in inches (as opposed to centimeters) add nothing of value to a federal jurisdictional argument.

1 jurisdiction over either defendant and the case against them must be dismissed.

2 **IV. CONCLUSION**

3 For the reasons stated hereinabove, Defendants Ideal Consult, Ltd. and Sergej Letyagin  
4 respectfully move for the dismissal of the Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) for lack  
5 of personal jurisdiction.

6 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2012.

7 **COTTON, DRIGGS, WALCH,  
8 HOLLEY, WOLOSON & THOMPSON**

9  
10 /s/ James D. Boyle  
11 JAMES D. BOYLE, ESQ.  
12 Nevada Bar No. 008384  
13 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor  
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

15 EVAN FRAY-WITZER, ESQ. (*pro hac vice*  
16 *application pending*)  
17 Massachusetts Bar No. 564349  
18 Email: Evan@CFWLegal.com  
19 Ciampa Fray-Witzer, LLP  
20 20 Park Plaza, Suite 804  
21 Boston, Massachusetts 02116  
22 Telephone: (617) 426-0000

23 VALENTIN DAVID GURVITS, ESQ. (*pro hac*  
24 *vice application pending*)  
25 Massachusetts Bar No. 643572  
26 Email: [vgurvits@BostonLawGroup.com](mailto:vgurvits@BostonLawGroup.com)  
27 BOSTON LAW GROUP, PC  
28 825 Beacon Street, Suite 20  
Newton, Massachusetts 02459  
Telephone:(617) 928-1804

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
7710  
7711  
7712  
7713  
7714  
7715  
7716  
7717  
7718  
7719  
7720  
7721  
7722  
7723  
7724  
7725  
7726  
7727  
7728  
7729  
7730  
7731  
7732  
7733  
7734  
7735  
7736  
7737  
7738  
7739  
7740  
7741  
7742  
7743  
7744  
7745  
7746  
7747  
7748  
7749  
7750  
7751  
7752  
7753  
7754  
7755  
7756  
7757  
7758  
7759  
7760  
7761  
7762  
7763  
7764  
7765  
7766  
7767  
7768  
7769  
7770  
7771  
7772  
7773  
7774  
7775  
7776  
7777  
7778  
7779  
77710  
77711  
77712  
77713  
77714  
77715  
77716  
77717  
77718  
77719  
77720  
77721  
77722  
77723  
77724  
77725  
77726  
77727  
77728  
77729  
77730  
77731  
77732  
77733  
77734  
77735  
77736  
77737  
77738  
77739  
77740  
77741  
77742  
77743  
77744  
77745  
77746  
77747  
77748  
77749  
77750  
77751  
77752  
77753  
77754  
77755  
77756  
77757  
77758  
77759  
77760  
77761  
77762  
77763  
77764  
77765  
77766  
77767  
77768  
77769  
77770  
77771  
77772  
77773  
77774  
77775  
77776  
77777  
77778  
77779  
777710  
777711  
777712  
777713  
777714  
777715  
777716  
777717  
777718  
777719  
777720  
777721  
777722  
777723  
777724  
777725  
777726  
777727  
777728  
777729  
777730  
777731  
777732  
777733  
777734  
777735  
777736  
777737  
777738  
777739  
777740  
777741  
777742  
777743  
777744  
777745  
777746  
777747  
777748  
777749  
777750  
777751  
777752  
777753  
777754  
777755  
777756  
777757  
777758  
777759  
777760  
777761  
777762  
777763  
777764  
777765  
777766  
777767  
777768  
777769  
777770  
777771  
777772  
777773  
777774  
777775  
777776  
777777  
777778  
777779  
7777710  
7777711  
7777712  
7777713  
7777714  
7777715  
7777716  
7777717  
7777718  
7777719  
7777720  
7777721  
7777722  
7777723  
7777724  
7777725  
7777726  
7777727  
7777728  
7777729  
7777730  
7777731  
7777732  
7777733  
7777734  
7777735  
7777736  
7777737  
7777738  
7777739  
7777740  
7777741  
7777742  
7777743  
7777744  
7777745  
7777746  
7777747  
7777748  
7777749  
7777750  
7777751  
7777752  
7777753  
7777754  
7777755  
7777756  
7777757  
7777758  
7777759  
7777760  
7777761  
7777762  
7777763  
7777764  
7777765  
7777766  
7777767  
7777768  
7777769  
7777770  
7777771  
7777772  
7777773  
7777774  
7777775  
7777776  
7777777  
7777778  
7777779  
77777710  
77777711  
77777712  
77777713  
77777714  
77777715  
77777716  
77777717  
77777718  
77777719  
77777720  
77777721  
77777722  
77777723  
77777724  
77777725  
77777726  
77777727  
77777728  
77777729  
77777730  
77777731  
77777732  
77777733  
77777734  
77777735  
77777736  
77777737  
77777738  
77777739  
77777740  
77777741  
77777742  
77777743  
77777744  
77777745  
77777746  
77777747  
77777748  
77777749  
77777750  
77777751  
77777752  
77777753  
77777754  
77777755  
77777756  
77777757  
77777758  
77777759  
77777760  
77777761  
77777762  
77777763  
77777764  
77777765  
77777766  
77777767  
77777768  
77777769  
77777770  
77777771  
77777772  
77777773  
77777774  
77777775  
77777776  
77777777  
77777778  
77777779  
777777710  
777777711  
777777712  
777777713  
777777714  
777777715  
777777716  
777777717  
777777718  
777777719  
777777720  
777777721  
777777722  
777777723  
777777724  
777777725  
777777726  
777777727  
777777728  
777777729  
777777730  
777777731  
777777732  
777777733  
777777734  
777777735  
777777736  
777777737  
777777738  
777777739  
777777740  
777777741  
777777742  
777777743  
777777744  
777777745  
777777746  
777777747  
777777748  
777777749  
777777750  
777777751  
777777752  
777777753  
777777754  
777777755  
777777756  
777777757  
777777758  
777777759  
777777760  
777777761  
777777762  
777777763  
777777764  
777777765  
777777766  
777777767  
777777768  
777777769  
777777770  
777777771  
777777772  
777777773  
777777774  
777777775  
777777776  
777777777  
777777778  
777777779  
7777777710  
7777777711  
7777777712  
7777777713  
7777777714  
7777777715  
7777777716  
7777777717  
7777777718  
7777777719  
7777777720  
7777777721  
7777777722  
7777777723  
7777777724  
7777777725  
7777777726  
7777777727  
7777777728  
7777777729  
7777777730  
7777777731  
7777777732  
7777777733  
7777777734  
7777777735  
7777777736  
7777777737  
7777777738  
7777777739  
7777777740  
7777777741  
7777777742  
7777777743  
7777777744  
7777777745  
7777777746  
7777777747  
7777777748  
7777777749  
7777777750  
7777777751  
7777777752  
7777777753  
7777777754  
7777777755  
7777777756  
7777777757  
7777777758  
7777777759  
7777777760  
7777777761  
7777777762  
7777777763  
7777777764  
7777777765  
7777777766  
7777777767  
7777777768  
7777777769  
7777777770  
7777777771  
7777777772  
7777777773  
7777777774  
7777777775  
7777777776  
7777777777  
7777777778  
7777777779  
77777777710  
77777777711  
77777777712  
77777777713  
77777777714  
77777777715  
77777777716  
77777777717  
77777777718  
77777777719  
77777777720  
77777777721  
77777777722  
77777777723  
77777777724  
77777777725  
77777777726  
77777777727  
77777777728  
77777777729  
77777777730  
77777777731  
77777777732  
77777777733  
77777777734  
77777777735  
77777777736  
77777777737  
77777777738  
77777777739  
77777777740  
77777777741  
77777777742  
77777777743  
77777777744  
77777777745  
77777777746  
77777777747  
77777777748  
77777777749  
77777777750  
77777777751  
77777777752  
77777777753  
77777777754  
77777777755  
77777777756  
77777777757  
77777777758  
77777777759  
77777777760  
77777777761  
77777777762  
77777777763  
77777777764  
77777777765  
77777777766  
77777777767  
77777777768  
77777777769  
77777777770  
77777777771  
77777777772  
77777777773  
77777777774  
77777777775  
77777777776  
77777777777  
77777777778  
77777777779  
777777777710  
777777777711  
777777777712  
777777777713  
777777777714  
777777777715  
777777777716  
777777777717  
777777777718  
777777777719  
777777777720  
777777777721  
777777777722  
777777777723  
777777777724  
777777777725  
777777777726  
777777777727  
777777777728  
777777777729  
777777777730  
777777777731  
777777777732  
777777777733  
777777777734  
777777777735  
777777777736  
777777777737  
777777777738  
777777777739  
777777777740  
777777777741  
777777777742  
777777777743  
777777777744  
777777777745  
777777777746  
777777777747  
777777777748  
777777777749  
777777777750  
777777777751  
777777777752  
777777777753  
777777777754  
777777777755  
777777777756  
777777777757  
777777777758  
777777777759  
777777777760  
777777777761  
777777777762  
777777777763  
777777777764  
777777777765  
777777777766  
777777777767  
777777777768  
777777777769  
777777777770  
777777777771  
777777777772  
777777777773  
777777777774  
777777777775  
777777777776  
777777777777  
777777777778  
777777777779  
7777777777710  
7777777777711  
7777777777712  
7777777777713  
7777777777714  
7777777777715  
7777777777716  
7777777777717  
7777777777718  
7777777777719  
7777777777720  
7777777777721  
7777777777722  
7777777777723  
7777777777724  
7777777777725  
7777777777726  
7777777777727  
7777777777728  
7777777777729  
7777777777730  
7777777777731  
7777777777732  
7777777777733  
7777777777734  
7777777777735  
7777777777736  
7777777777737  
7777777777738  
7777777777739  
7777777777740  
7777777777741  
7777777777742  
7777777777743  
7777777777744  
7777777777745  
7777777777746  
7777777777747  
77777777

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2012, I caused the document entitled **DEFENDANTS SERGEJ LETYAGIN AND IDEAL CONSULT, LTD.'S MOTION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION**, to be served as follows:

Attorneys of Record	Parties Represented	Method of Service
Marc J. Randazza, Esq. Randazza Legal Group 6525 West Warm Springs Rd., Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118 E-mail: <a href="mailto:mjr@randazza.com">mjr@randazza.com</a>	Plaintiff, Liberty Media Holdings, LLC	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal Service <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email/E-File <input type="checkbox"/> Fax Service <input type="checkbox"/> Mail Service

DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2012.

/s/ Kim Cooper  
An Employee of Cotton, Driggs, Walch,  
Holley, Woloson & Thompson